

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present amendment is provided as a submission in connection with a request for continued examination (RCE) filed herewith.

The office action of September 21, 2007, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 12, 16, 17, 23, 27, and 31 have been amended. Claim 17 has been amended to be in a more preferred form. Claims 34-39 have been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 10-39 remain pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 10-18, 20-25, 27, and 29-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukui *et al.* (US 6940532, hereinafter “Fukui”) and Arbab *et al.* (US 6778192, hereinafter “Arbab”) as applied to claim 16 and in further view of Ishikawa (US 5506951). Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukui, Arbab, Ishikawa as applied to claim 16 and in further view of Eisenberg (US 6331866). Claim 32-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukui, Arbab, Ishikawa as applied to claim 16 and in further view of Martinez *et al.* (US 6147683). Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukui, Arbab, Ishikawa as applied to claim 23 and in further view of MacPhail (US 6924797). Claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukui, Arbab, Ishikawa as applied to claim 27 and in further view of MacPhail.

Amended claim 16 calls for, *inter alia*, a system configured such that a first user may identify the item of interest, and a second user may access the storage component to change the location of the item of interest. Fukui, Ishikawa, Arbab, or any combination thereof, fails to disclose these features. For at least the above reasons, claim 16 is allowable.

Claims 10-15, 17-18, 20-25, 27, and 29-31 are ultimately dependent on claim 16 and thus are allowable for the same reasons as claim 16 and in further view of their novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

For example, amended claim 12 calls for removing the graphical indicator from scroll bar via unhighlighting the item of interest. Arbab merely describes stub point removal on the basis of scroll bar activity. See col. 2, lines 43-52. Fukui does not describe that the removal of a graphical indicator can be performed by unhighlighting the item of interest. See col. 8, lines 9-20. Ishikawa describes deleting of tags, but requires a user to click on the jump tag and select the delete option wholly distinct from unhighlighting the item of interest. See Fig. 3b. Therefore, Fukui, Ishikawa or Arbab, or any combination thereof, does not disclose removing the graphical indicator from a scroll bar via unhighlighting the item of interest. Claim 12 is patentable for this additional reason.

Claim 19 depends on claim 16 and is allowable at least because Eisenberg does not overcome the deficiency of Fukui, Arbab, and Ishikawa as applied to claim 16. As such, the combination of Fukui, Arbab, Ishikawa, and Eisenberg, even if proper, does not result in the invention of claim 19.

Claims 32 and 33 ultimately depend back to claim 16 and are allowable at least because Martinez does not overcome the deficiency of Fukui, Arbab, and Ishikawa as applied to claim 16. As such, the combination of Fukui, Arbab, Ishikawa, and Martinez, even if proper, does not result in the invention of claims 32-33.

Amended independent claim 23 recites, *inter alia*, the feature of changing the location of the point of focus based on input from a second user of a plurality of users in the shared environment. Fukui, Ishikawa, Arbab, or any combination thereof, fails to disclose this feature. For at least the above reason, claim 23 is allowable.

Claim 24-25 each depend on claim 23 and are allowable for at least the same reason as claim 23 and in further view of their novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Amended independent claim 27 recites, *inter alia*, the feature of “changing the location of the point of focus based on user input from a second user moving the graphical indicator on the scroll bar.” Fukui, Ishikawa or Arbab, or any combination thereof, fails to disclose this feature. For at least the above reason, claim 27 is allowable.

Claims 29-30 each depend on claim 27 and are allowable for at least the same reason as claim 27 and in further view of their novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Claim 26 ultimately depends back to claim 23, and claim 28 depends on claim 27. Claims 26 and 28 are allowable at least because MacPhail does not overcome the deficiency of Fukui, Arbab, and Ishikawa with respect to claims 23 and 27, respectively. As such, the combination of Fukui, Arbab, Ishikawa, and MacPhail, even if proper, does not result in the invention of claims 26 and 28. As such, claim 26 and 28 are allowable.

Amended independent claim 31 recites, *inter alia*, the feature of “means for moving the graphical indicia to change the location of the associated foci based on user input from a first user in a shared environment, and to change the location of the associate foci based on user input from a second user in a shared environment.” Fukui, Ishikawa, Arbab, or any combination thereof, fails to disclose this feature. For at least the above reason, claim 31 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. If the examiner has any questions or needs any additional information, the examiner is invited to contact Applicant’s undersigned representative at (202) 824-3153.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: January 22, 2008

By: /Ross Dannenberg/
Ross A. Dannenberg
Registration No. 49,024
1100 13th Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001